

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are presently in the application. The above amendments are being made to place the application in better condition for examination.

Claims 1, 2, and 3 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,295,409 to Byram et al.

Claim 1 is directed to an accelerator pedal module (1) comprising,
a bearing block (4) embodied as a one-piece molded part comprising a bearing region having a bearing bore and at least one bearing face (82),
a pedal lever (2) retained rotatably in bearing face (82) and being coaxial with a pivot axis (20) on the bearing block (4),
a rotation sensor (102) having a sensor shaft (100) actuated by the pedal lever (2), the sensor shaft being coaxial with the pivot axis (20), and
at least a part (104) of the sensor shaft (100) being directly supported rotatably in the bearing bore (98) of the bearing region of the bearing block (4), wherein at least part of a radial surface of said bearing region forms said at least one bearing face (82) for the pedal lever (2).

Byram et al is relied upon by the examiner for showing bearing block 65, pedal lever 14, rotation sensor 34, sensor shaft 12, bearing bore 18, bearing faces 18, 28, hollow peg 18, and a plurality of partly cylindrical bearing faces 84. Byram et al lacks a showing or even a suggestion that the components of the bearing block are embodied as a one-piece molded part comprising a bearing region having a bearing bore and at least one bearing face. Claim 1 has

Appl. No. 10/734,214
Amdt. dated August 25, 2006
In reply to Office action of May 25, 2006

been amended to recite that *the bearing block is embodied as a one-piece molded part comprising a bearing region having a bearing bore and at least one bearing face* to distinguish that the **components** of the bearing block are integral and formed in one piece. As such, Byram et al does not anticipate claims 1-3 and accordingly reconsideration of the rejection is earnestly requested.

Claims 4 and 5 have been rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Byram et al in view of US Patent No. 5,385,068 to White et al.


The examiner has rejected claims 6-12 under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Byram et al in view of White et al, and further in view of US Patent No. 5,805,376 to Papenhagen et al.

Claim 1 requires that the elements of the bearing block comprising a bearing region, a bearing bore, and at least one bearing face be embodied as a “one-piece, molded part.” Byram et al lacks a showing that the elements are formed as a “one-piece, molded part”, as discussed above. To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). Since White et al and Papenhagen et al are relied upon for showing elements lacking in Byram et al in the rejections of claims 4 and 5, and of claims 6-12, respectively, none of the references taken alone or in combination show or suggest the invention as claimed. Therefore the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 103 is moot and reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/734,214
Amdt. dated August 25, 2006
In reply to Office action of May 25, 2006

Entry of the amendment is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,


JOHN F. GONZALES
REG. # 50,209

for Ronald E. Greigg
Registration No. 31,517
Attorney for Applicant
CUSTOMER NO. 02119

GREIGG & GREIGG, P.L.L.C.
1423 Powhatan Street, Suite One
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone: (703) 838-5500
Facsimile: (703) 838-5554

REG/JAK/hhl

J:\Bosch\R304572\Reply to 5-25-06 OA.wpd